DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 387 HE 019 907

AUTHOR Seagren, Alan T.; And Others
TITLE Perception of Chairpersons and Faculty concerning Roles, Descriptors, and Activities Important for Faculty Development and Departmental Vitality.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; College Faculty; *College Programs; *Department Heads; Departments; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; *Organizational Effectiveness; Program Administration; Program Effectiveness; Questionnaires; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Vitality

ABSTRACT

Activities and roles of department heads that can improve departmental and faculty effectiveness were investigated, along with dimensions associated with departmental leadership of chairpersons. In the first of two studies, department heads at four-year institutions were interviewed to identify views of existing conditions in higher education, roles performed by chairpersons, career development issues, and strategies used to increase department vitality and faculty development. Vice-Chancellors or Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs identified department heads who are best at helping faculty grow and be productive, as well as faculty that have demonstrated considerable faculty growth. A total of 33 chairpersons and 29 faculty were interviewed. In the second study, chief academic officers at three midwest, urban universities identified outstanding departments with active and effective chairpersons. The 19 selected chairpersons were interviewed to identify dimensions of effective departmental leadership and management strategies. Appended is a chart that outlines seven roles performed by outstanding chairpersons, descriptions of these roles, and activities that were designed to promote faculty development and departmental vitality. The department head questionnaire is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276387

Perception of Chairperson and Faculty Concerning Roles Descriptors and Activities Important For Faculty Development and Departmental Vitality

Dr. Alan T. Seagren
University of Nebraska

Dr. Daniel W. Wheeler
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Ms. Mary Mitchell
Clarkson College of Nursing

Dr. John W. Creswell
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alan T. Seagren

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 019 907

Background

A number of authors have indicated that the departmental chairperson is a critical link in establishing the departmental climate, development of departmental goals, designing activities to meet these goals and fostering professional development of faculty (Bennett 1983, Tucker 1984, Wolothiewioz 1980). The centralness of the chairperson position is well stated by J. W. Peltason, Past President of the American Council on Education, "An institution can run for a long time with an inept president, but not long with an inept chairperson." (Tucker 1984, Forward) Roach estimates that 80% of all administrative decisions in colleges occur at the departmental level (Roach 1976). Departmental chairs engage in a complex set of responsibilities in the following areas of departmental governance, instruction, student affairs, external communication, budget and resources, office management, and professional development of staff (Tucker 1984). Even though the importance of the chairperson is generally acknowledged, little and practically no work has been done to examine how a chairperson developed departments. Much that has been done is focused upon a distillation of roles, functions and activities of those who have held the position (Knight and Holen, 1985). Given the crucial nature of the chairperson as an essential link between faculty and the administration, this study addresses the question: What do chairpersons do to develop faculty and to keep the department vital? Specifically, what activities are used in this development and what leadership characteristics are exhibited by effective chairpersons? However, before addressing these questions, previous relevant studies of chairpersons will be highlighted and a brief statement concerning the context of higher education is presented for background for the chairperson's study.

Previous Studies of Chairpersons

The head of the department in the college or university occupies a key role in the operation of the institution. As stated earlier it is estimated that 80% of all administrative decisions in colleges and universities occur at the departmental level. The chairman or head of department is the person responsible for the leadership and management of the main activities of an institution, teaching, research and service and for the people and resources involved in those activities. He or she has a complex set of responsibilities which span a wide range of internal departmental components including both academic support, staff, students, financial resources, teaching programs, and research activities; while at the same time acting as the major link between the department, the institution as a whole and the external community (Tucker 1984, Bennet 1983). In studying the complexity of roles, a number of investigators (Bragg 1981, Booth 1982, McLaughlin et al 1981, Seagren, Creswell and Henry 1979) describe the technical functions of scheduling, budgeting, curriculum and instruction, internal administration, human relations, personal and professional development but don't address the human resource functions of communicator, problem solver and leader. One of the important findings of the studies is that most chairpersons have had little training for the transition to an administrative position even though there is general acknowledgment of the complexity of the role and difficulty of the transition. Gaff wrote,

> "Just as faculty members receive little preparation for their instructional roles, administrators have little training for the leadership, policy formulation, administrative and managerial roles of their work. Departmental chairpersons, deans, vice presidents, and presidents, no less that faculty members, need to develop and furthermore they need to encourage and support the growth of the individuals in their charge."

(Gaff 1979) Knight and Holen (1985) studied the ratings of chairpersons' effectiveness based upon the DECAD (Departmental Evaluation of the Chairperson Activities for Development) in 65 higher education institutions. The most important finding was that the most effective chairs have high ratings on both "initiating structure" and "consideration" and that high ratings were associated with high ratings on at least one or the other. This research suggests that chairpersons to be effective need to use active strategies to address tasks to be accomplished as well as develop relationships in the department.

In a related study, Ahmann (1972) charges that effective chairpersons must exemplify change, growth and improvement rather than stagnation, ossification and indifference. The chairperson is viewed as a "change agent" within the institution; one who is capable of initiating and directing change which will lead to improved quality of the department.

Leadership styles of university department chairpersons were studied by Neumann and Boris (1978). They utilized a technology environment contingency model of leader behavior in an attempt to evaluate leadership style variance within academic disciplines. Results confirmed their hypothesis that the greatest leadership effectiveness exists where leadership style reflects the differential paradigm of the academic discipline.

In a 1977 study, Brown identified several essential qualifications for becoming an effective chairperson. Among them was the "art of leadership", which Brown defined as the characteristic or ability needed to anticipate problems, communicate informally and openly, and achieve consensus before issues escalate. Indecisive leadership appears to create confusion and doubt among department faculty.

The essential quality of leadership by department chairpersons is further supported by Jennerich (1981) who queried 300 department chairpersons. The results indicated that "leadership ability" was ranked second only to "character/integrity" as necessary for chairperson effectiveness. It is apparent that leadership is considered an essential quality to effectively chair academic departments.

Wheeler and Creswell (1985 AERA Paper) identified strategies used by departmental chairpersons and departmental faculty to encourage research development. Many of these strategies were distilled from a research review of the faculty productivity literature. These studies suggest that a number of roles and functions have been identified and there is more written about the "technical functions" rather than the "human resources functions" of the departmental chairperson.

Changing Work Conditions in Academic Departments

The higher education context in 1986. There is little doubt higher education in most places is no longer a growth industry. repeatedly various authors have noted that faculty are graying, more tenured and less mobile. These faculty trends are evident because of the demographics, fewer students are available and with decreasing resources to accomplish the work.

In an intensive study of the professoriate by Bowen and Schuster (1985) faculty expressed concern about their work environment, lack of collegial relationships, and a continued loss of prestige in economic power. The professoriate is described as sensing the external pressures including an unstable economy and wavering governmental support. Many faculty became socialized in a "growth industry" and are having difficulty adjusting to "a no

growth industry: or "a down sized organization". Another contextual issue identified by Wheeler and Creswell (1985) and Sorcinelli (1985) is as Sorcinelli describes "Faculty perceive a growing impersonality on the part of colleagues at every level and express a desire for support and acknowledgment of their contributions." The problem of fewer resources, internal and external rewards creates a difficult issue for the chairperson. A need exists for recognition on the part of faculty which means the chairperson must incorporate within his range of skills and strategies utilized with faculty the very best from the latest in management and motivational techniques. This complexity of contextual variables makes Tucker's (1984 p. 1) remarks about academic departments even more salient.

> "Can institutions of higher education maintain flexibility and viability, preserve quality, remain accountable and respond effectively to the changing needs of society within the context. . . of steady state or even declining resources, academic departments or the organizational unit within the institutions that are most severely affected by steady state or declining resources. Those who chair these departments have considerable influence in resolving this problem."

Focus of This Study

Given that chairpersons are expected to play a critical role in departmental production and effectiveness, that they have received little training to perform their work, and that little has been researched beyond a description of roles, functions, and responsibilities, this study focuses on describing activities related to roles used to improve departmental and faculty effectiveness, and to describe dimensions which are associated with departmental leadership of chairpersons. As Bennett (1983 p. 1) describes, "a chair is the one responsible for getting things done" and this study emphasizes what chairpersons do that make a difference in

departments and the lives of departments.

Methodology

Two separate studies were conducted to gather data regarding chairperson activities and department leadership. In the first study, department chairpersons were interviewed to identify the perceptions of the conditions existing, in higher education, the roles chairpersons perform, career development issues, and the strategies utilized to increase department vitality and faculty development. A structured interview was developed (see Appendix I).

After determining questions for the structured interview, institutions were selected for a pilot study. Community colleges were not included in the selection since the researchers decided that the role of chairperson in these institutions were too different from other four year institutions. The interviews were conducted in small private colleges, one large private University, a major land grant institution, an urban university and two four year state colleges.

The researchers decided to focus on "best practices" of department chairpersons to provide descriptions of roles and effective activities. Selection of chairs and faculty, was accomplished by asking each of the Vice-Chancellors or Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs to:

1) Identify chairpersons who are best at helping faculty grow and being productive.
2) Identify faculty in whom you have seen considerable faculty growth.

There was no particular intent to identify chairpersons and faculty from

the same departments. Interviewing of faculty was to confirm whether faculty identified similar roles and activities as those identified by chairpersons.

Interviews were conducted by four members of a Task Force on Departmental Chairpersons. All chairpersons and faculty contacted agreed to be interviewed. In all, 33 chairpersons and 29 faculty were interviewed. Interviews ranged in time from 45 minutes to 90 minutes with an average of 60 minutes.

The second study utilized the constant comparative method for data collection. This method depends upon a procedure called "theoretical sampling" which "is a process of data collecting . . . whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyzes (the) . . . data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop . . . (a) theory as it emerges" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. 45). In other words, the emerging theory guides sample selection, the search for data most relevant to the generation and verification of theory. Outstanding chairpersons from urban universities were interviewed based on the emerging core variable -- leadership effectiveness.

Letters were sent to the chief academic officers at three urban universities located in the midwest. They were requested to identify outstanding departments with notably active and effective chairpersons. Specific instructions included: "Criteria for judging departments and chairpersons should be those most appropriate to your institution and environmental context. We might suggest productivity, economic efficiency, quality faculty, curriculum and students, and/or faculty morale."

The selected chairpersons were interviewed in an effort to identify dimensions of effective departmental leadership and management strategies

which may be utilized to enhance chairperson effectiveness. A total of 19 chairpersons were interviewed. Interviews ranged from 45 to 75 minutes in length and were tape recorded to verify notes taken by the researcher.

Results from the Interviews

Tucker (1984) identified 29 roles a chairperson may assume. As contrasted to describing a complete list of roles, this study focused on what roles and activities do chairpersons perform that make a difference in the professional and personal lives of faculty. Chairpersons and faculty identified seven roles they believe are critical to the development of faculty and sense of faculty vitality.

The roles identified were: Communicator, Facilitator, Academic Leader, Motivator, Counselor, Politician, and Manager of "Administrivia". The roles most frequently mentioned were Communicator, Facilitator, and Academic Leader. The role of Motivator was not a specifically described role but a derived role based upon the suggested activities. The descriptors and activities for each of the roles are described in Chart I (See Appendix II). Each of the roles will be further analyzed in terms of the descriptors and activities.

Within the communicator role four descriptors, honest, openness, keeping people informed and the setting or keeping of a positive tone were identified as being important to establishing a working environment and a climate for the department which was perceived by faculty as being positives in encouraging people to remain productive and vital. In terms of honesty, it was obvious that most faculty wanted forthright feedback both in terms of positive as well as constructive criticism. They appreciated consistency in response about important issues. In terms of openness, they wanted their chairperson to be a

good listener, to meet faculty on their turf in their offices, to act as a sounding board so faculty could feel free to discuss a wide range of issues and to explore in an open manner their interests and the relationship of these interests to the ongoing departmental thrusts or institutional incentives. The faculty appreciated one-to-one interactions, weekly memos, and newsletters about accomplishment. It was clear in the interviews one of the most important dimensions was the face-to-face contact with the chairperson and the faculty. Finally, in terms of the last descriptor related to the role of communicator was the setting and keeping of a positive tone. A wide range of specific activities were suggested for letting faculty know that they are doing a good job. Notes, letters, personal comments, and any recognition given privately or within group settings were all appreciated. Assisting faculty in developing their ideas as well as creating environments in which faculty can assist others in developing their ideas were also rated as important.

In terms of the broad basic role of facilitator there were three descriptors that emerged, removing obstacles, assisting in requests and proposals and mentoring. Specific activities related to removing obstacles were such things as adjusting schedules, providing secretarial assistance, following up on needed resources, and asking if there are ways or things that the chairperson could do to make it possible for the faculty member to achieve his or her objectives. In terms of the assisting in requests and proposal descriptor activities suggested, included bringing to the attention of faculty members the availability of research dollars, summer research fellowships, and travel grants; making the faculty aware of the availability of outside resources and the deadline for submitting papers for national meetings;

and serving as a broker of the interest of faculty. Finally, for the descriptor of mentoring the activities suggested were assisting beginning faculty in the molding and socializing into the department, helping younger faculty link up with more established faculty within the department for assistance in teaching publishing and service, assisting faculty member in being knowledgeable about the promotion and tenure requirements, facilitating the achievement of these requirements, and encouraging senior faculty to look for opportunities to involve beginning faculty in research projects, preparation of papers for national meetings and service activities.

The descriptors related to the basic role of academic leader were presiding over the academic program, developing the attitude of "a community of scholars" providing directives to the departments, selecting of faculty, setting academic standards and expectations, and encouraging faculty to do better in terms of professional growth and development. Specific activities related to the descriptor of developing the community of scholars include, organizing the faculty so that they can address the curriculum concerns within an open and constructive environment, to initiate and provide opportunities for outstanding and distinguished faculty awards for teaching, research and service, to encourage innovation and teaching, research and service, to promote and encourage the interdisciplinarian activities such as dual degrees, new courses and innovative course deliveries. In terms of the descriptor of providing direction to the department activities include, conducting meetings, orchestrating the interrelationship of faculty within the department, selecting and appointing key individuals to important committees within the department seeking consensus on key issues and ideas, managing the internal

formal and informal dialogue within the department and discussing the congruence or lack thereof of individual and departmental goals. One of the most important descriptors, of course, is the recruitment and selection of faculty. Here, the activities are quite obvious, identify and seek all sources for identifying outstanding and curious people, to hire people with expertise and with an understanding of the general cultural and academic environment that exists within the institution, and to look for people especially within research institutions that can bring with them grants and connections with national associations, federal and other agencies. In terms of the descriptor of encouraging people to be better the activities suggested included structuring faculty exchange of ideas about their work, encouraging faculty member to observe the outstanding teaching of one of their colleagues, distributing within the department the abstracts of articles and products that have been produced, recommending faculty for review panels, encouraging faculty to attend national meetings, giving rewards for submitting papers and providing the resources for attendance at national meetings if their work has been selected for inclusion on the program. Finally, in terms of setting of academic expectations descriptor it was terribly important to uphold the highest degree of quality and establish the need for excellence, both through modeling as well as expectations. Chairpersons should set a climate in which the normal expectation is that every faculty member will be productive in terms of scholarly output, provide for distribution of effort and accomplishment reports to all faculty within the department, reinforce and provide a protective environment for faculty even if some of their professional colleagues may not see the importance of the topic or type of research which has been conducted.

In terms of the basic role of motivator, there were four descriptors identified, a protective role or shield, a coach, a developmental approach or attitude and modeling. The protective role is similar in some ways to the comments made about the academic expectations in the previous role of academic leader. Activities of the protective role descriptor included attempting to keep static out of the department or remove as much inertia as possible, integrate the ideas of new faculty into the thinking of the more established faculty members of the department and establish standards that are accepted and integrated into the total operation of the department. The next descriptor was defined as a coach. The activities related to these descriptors were centered around those things that are reinforcing and encouraging as well as giving directions and assisting people when they need to be helped or to clarify what needs to be done. Coaching may come about through an assessment or evaluation process although later we will make a comment about the negative comments received from certain faculty related to formal evaluations developed or designed around a management by objective approach. Faculty generally wanted the feedback from the chairperson concerning how they were doing and direction on how they could become more productive. The assisting with goal setting for faculty, the listing of faculty accomplishments, the praise received for ones accomplishments both from the chairperson as well as from other faculty, the daily or at least weekly contact between chairperson, the dropping in the office and the face-to-face contact in terms of reviewing what the faculty member is doing, the reinforcing of performance through notes, verbal praise, one-to-one contact or in writing recommendations were all seen as important. Specific activities

related to the developmental approach were arranging matches of peoples interests and organizational needs, internalizing differentiated staffing which focuses on the strengths of the staff member, providing seed money or discretionary money for faculty, the use of faculty leaves, rotation assignments for self-development, the assignment faculty to particular committees designed to bring diverse ideas or contrasting points of view together. The final descriptor related to the broad role of motivator was modeling. The faculty felt it was tremendously important for the chairperson to display a high energy and positive attitude as well as setting high personal performance and productivity standards which can be emulated by faculty within the department.

The next basic role as counselor had only one general descriptor which was a hand holder or perspective taker. Specific activities related to this descriptor included assessment of when people are down and responding to needs, helping faculty sort out those things that pay off and are important, helping faculty reduce those things that have a low payoff or could result in losses, recognizing various personal development needs and opportunities, helping relieve the pressure of the stress and providing emotional support for faculty members.

The next basic role was described as politician. The descriptors here were the link between the department and other administrative units within the university and the representation of the department to constituents outside of the university. Specific activities related to linking the department to other administrative units within the university, included the importance of the chairperson to be capable of conveying the importance of work of the department and why the department was important to the total university as

well as how it links to the other departments and units within the university. The activities relating to the descriptions of representing the department outside of the university included fighting for the department, determining and implementing trade offs, working for credit for the faculty, maintaining the institutional activities in terms of advising, recruiting and teaching, promoting individual's scholarly activities of faculty and securing outside dollars.

The final basic roles was manager of administrivia. The descriptor here was handling the paperwork and basic organizational tasks for the department. The specific activities faculty felt that too many departmental chairpersons hid behind paper and merely were paper pushers and did not provide leadership. Structures related to this description included, budgeting, scheduling, personnel administration, student administration, etc. While these are viewed as important on the part of the faculty, most faculty did not think they contributed a great deal to the overall vitality of the department or the performance of faculty.

Leader values most often expressed during the interviews of outstanding chairpersons include: unselfishness; fairness and honesty; mutual trust and respect; professional freedom and responsibility; proactive leadership; open communication; collegiality and cooperation; flexibility and versatility; and collective excellence before individual achievement. Other authors refer to leader values as qualities or competencies inherent in effective leaders. However, in a setting where leaders (department chairpersons) have received little or no formal training. The values appeared to be part of an internal guidance system that enhanced flexibility and effectiveness.

The effective chairpersons also stated the importance of valuing the

uniqueness and worth of every faculty member in their department. They appreciated the differences among faculty and utilized individual talents and contributions to support the department. chairpersons interviewed recognized the importance of knowing what is most important to each individual. They used that knowledge to solve problems creatively and rewarded individuals on differing but equitable criteria. Several chairpersons openly expressed the presence of leader values; while in other situations, values could only be inferred from the actions and activities described.

Management strategies utilized by effective chairpersons were closely related to several of the leader values previously mentioned. The strategies most commonly mentioned include: meeting the faculty's need for recognition; facilitating a nurturing environment for faculty; increased department communication, collegiality and visibility; promoting resource acquisition for optimizing productivity in teaching, research and service; facilitating faculty self-development; and motivation strategies to enhance faculty productivity using positive feedback, growth contracts, financial rewards, and peer recognition. All chairpersons interviewed expressed a humanistic concern for the professional needs of faculty not currently being met by the work environment.

General Observations

An immediate observation in the faculty interviews was that when they were questioned on the topic of conditions of the department and concerns about research, teaching, and service, they persisted at length in discussing these areas. A particular concern of the university faculty, previously identified by Bowen and Schuster (1985), was the changing nature of

expectations -- a press for more research. With the weight of these conditions on faculty minds and emotions, one wonders about the toll in considering possible solutions and clarification of directions.

Another intense area for faculty concerned the push toward accountability with annual evaluations and activities such as goal setting. One senior faculty member stated, "Evaluation is the most ridiculous thing we do." On the other hand, chairpersons indicated the importance of evaluation conferences and such activities as goal setting to focus communication and to identify accomplishments and direction. The larger the department, the more these evaluation activities were formalized.

A surprising finding was that few faculty could articulate the specific activities used by department chairs to promote professional and personal development. Faculty did state the importance of communication and providing support but usually were not specific about activities. In one case a faculty member indicated that he knew the chairperson did something with a "stuck" faculty member but he really didn't want to know what he did.

Chairpersons were better at articulating the roles and activities without being overwhelmed by conditions. Particularly after chairs had been in the role four years or more, their energies were focused on the activities of hiring and protecting new faculty, promotion and tenure actions, evaluations, and seeking outside resources.

Another surprising finding was that chairpersons described their faculty in dichotomous or, occasionally, trichotomous groupings. Chairs were well focused on what they needed to do to socialize and protect new faculty by use of activities that included mentoring, released time, and absence of most committee assignments.

However, when long-term faculty were described in terms of effective development activities, they often were lumped in one group. A few times there was a differentiation between older, effective faculty and what McKeachie describes as "dozers", but this was the exception.

Consequently, chairpersons made few references to activities or strategies related to "the Career State Literature". It would appear this literature (Baldwin and Blackburn 1981, Erikson 1959, Furniss 1981, Gould 1978, Hodgkinson 1974, Levinson 1978, Mathis 1979, Palmer and Patton 1981, Vaillant 1977, Weathersby and Tarule 1980) could provide some "handles" that might be useful to chairs. A few faculty, particularly ones in the middle to late stages of their careers, did refer to some of the developmental findings. For example, to quote one senior faculty member, "We need to sensitize administrators and faculty to the mid-career issues that may require a major career shift." He pointed out that this transition will require time off to think and plan. One has to ask why isn't this career stage literature a part of the chair's assessment process?

One reason chairpersons may not be sensitive to or have the language to describe some of the developmental issues is that the sample included few departments with a full range of ranks and ages. In many cases there was a bimodal distribution with new, untenured people at one end and senior, tenured faculty at the other. In some cases only one or two faculty were between the two distributions. In two departments in the state colleges, no new faculty had been hired for twelve and fifteen years.

One can hypothesize that unless the full range of ranks and ages is involved, a chair may fall into using simpler distinctions. As partial support for that hypothesis, one growing department with a full range of

faculty did have more career development categories than rank, and three chairpersons described taking a developmental perspective toward faculty work. One indicated the work itself provides the developmental obstacles-or to quote this chair, "as people grow, they take on bigger issues".

There was a tension described between beginning and senior faculty. It was described that with beginning faculty the workload pyramid has become reversed with newcomers having more time which is targeted toward research. As one senior professor remarked, "I used to think senior people would be given reduced loads." He no longer sees this possibility. This trend of bringing the "hot dogs" was voiced as a factor in demoralizing senior faculty and is substantiated by the work of Bowen and Schuster (1985). Certainly a concern is that the salary differential will be even more intense if departments maintain the bimodal distribution of beginners versus long-timers.

Throughout the interviews, concerns were expressed by chairpersons in dealing with "stuck" (Kanter 1979) or perceived inactive faculty members. The two roles and sets of activities that were identified as most appropriate for addressing this concern were Motivator and Counselor. In cases in which chairs believed the senior faculty were not carrying their load, they were using or leaning toward "more drastic actions".

In one case the teaching was so poor, based on continuous reports from both students and faculty, that the chair told the faculty member he would no longer teach until he demonstrated improvements in organization and attitude. Other chairpersons indicated that they were using more confrontative strategies which is reflected in the honesty aspect in the role of a communicator. As one chair commented, "particularly in a small department, one just can't absorb a non-functioning member". Some chairpersons in large

departments declared that they do not worry about the few "stuck" faculty but rather, spend their time helping those who are willing to produce and who need the most help. It was evident that total department effectiveness was the ultimate goal and that this could best be promoted through support of the majority of the faculty -- "the movers."

Control over financial resources, institutionally derived and/or departmentally generated, may be an additive factor in chairperson effectiveness. Resource control influences the extent that some strategies can be utilized. Much variance exists in the amount of resource control given chairpersons by deans. Some deans retain total control of the budget, while others allow proportionate amounts to be controlled by the chairpersons. Where the dean retained control, there appeared to be more "outside the system" fund-raising. Chairpersons who were given responsibility for the department budget were able to work more effectively within the system, although most also sought external funds.

In interviewing faculty, the concept of "non-productivity" was a difficult one on which to gain agreement. A number of faculty, particularly in the university setting, expressed the concern that the institution needs to continue rewarding activities that maintain the organization--advising students, serving on committees, providing service--and not just counting research publications. As one professor exclaimed, "The institution needs to reward school being kept". Schein's (1978) work on matching individual and institutional needs is particularly useful in making assignments.

In this regard, Clark (1985) and Mathis (1979) suggest the need for, as Clark states (p. 134), "recognizing the full range of faculty accomplishments". Kanter's (1979) comments further imply that those who are

"moving" rather than "stuck" will maintain their aspirations and continue to develop.

Conclusions and Future Directions

As the description of roles and activities indicates, outstanding chairpersons or departmental heads in this study performed seven described roles and provide a variety of activities to address faculty professional development and departmental vitality. Most of these roles are ones in which they have had little or no training but have perfected "on-the-job" and through feedback from their administrative peers.

Most of the chairpersons state they have enough satisfaction from their role to want to continue. However, a small number of "satisfiers" were actually identified and that list was shorter than "dissatisfiers". An area for further research is to specifically identify those unstated reasons for being attracted to an administrative position. For example, two indirect factors identified were power and money. If people are to be attracted and retained in administrative work given the changing conditions in higher education, the "satisfiers": need to be understood and attractive enough to maintain interest.

Except for communication patterns, few differences were noted between roles and activities used in larger (greater than 20 FTE) versus smaller (less than 20 FTE) departments. In larger departments there was more use of written communications (memos and newsletters) and delegation through an assistant administrator and committee chairs. The smaller departments had much more "management by walking around" with personal visits and discussions. As one chair of a small department commented, "I can easily get around to see all of

the faculty in one day." It may be assumed that chairs in larger departments saw the task of communication as a global problem rather than an individual problem. The logistics of size may be a determining factor in methods of departmental communication.

An important finding is that few chairs have either the language or awareness of the adult and career development literature to provide an enabling framework for professional development. The developmental issues for mid-career and older faculty were continually more difficult for chairs to verbalize than for the issues of those beginning a career. Further research should explore ways in which chairpersons could most effectively evaluate and aid mid-career and older faculty. Development opportunities to enhance faculty productivity during mid-career and older stages will become increasingly important given the changing environment in academic departments.

A number of chairs described themselves as mentors to beginning faculty but the only kind of mentoring mentioned with peers was modeling. There were many pejorative categories used to describe some senior faculty ("deadwood", "non-producer", "non-contributor") rather than the use of terms (such as "maintainer", "mentor") that have a sense of productivity and effectiveness. Even "dozer" (coined by McKeachie) has the opposite side of "awakening".

Many of the activities described by chairpersons fit well under Kanter's (1977 and 1979) opportunity structure, which are particularly important in difficult times when people feel a lack of challenge and lack of career advancement. Opportunity structure provides "paths, tracks, and ladders to perceive a sense of `movement'."

It should be further noted that several of the leader values expressed by effective chairpersons are congruent with the critical roles identified by chairpersons and faculty. It becomes apparent that chairpersons are leaders far beyond the arena of the curriculum and scholarly activity. They are viewed as the hub for all activities, daily and developmental, which will lead to an effective department. Strategies utilized to accomplish these tasks will undoubtedly vary between individuals, but commonalities exist in dimensions of communication, resource acquisition and motivation to enhance productivity.

Unless the strategy is to write off faculty (a tremendous waste of resources), there needs to be more language and energy focused on "the awakening" process. One of the most promising activities cited by chairs is the matching of faculty interests with institutional needs and then rewarding faculty for these contributions. The assumption then is that there may be a mismatch if faculty are ineffective in the role and there may need to be rearranging of matches. A fertile area of study would be what are the critical variables in the "matchmaking".

APPENDIX I

3/3/86

STRUCTURED DEPARTMENT CHAIR QUESTIONNAIRE

INTRODUCTION

We are conducting an exploratory study of what department chairs do to enhance departmental and faculty vitality. This interview consists of open-ended questions about your roles and tasks in the department, your career, the conditions of your department, and the strategies you use to enhance departmental and faculty vitality.

If you are ready, let's begin with some preliminary descriptive questions about your department.

I. Preliminary Data

How many faculty are there in your department?

How were you selected to be the department chair or head?

How long have you been in the position?

How long do you expect to stay in the position?

Have you had any particular training to prepare you for this job?

Is there a written job description? (If yes, ask for a copy)

What is the basic mission of your department? (undergraduate, graduate, both)

Do you have a mission in research and service?

II. There have been a number of studies examining the conditions of higher education. We are interested in examining the conditions under which you and the faculty work.

1. Describe your department as you perceive it today.

2. Describe the department as you would like it to be.

3. Are there particular concerns about your faculty related to teaching, research, and service? What are they?

4. What do you need to do to achieve your perception of the ideal department?

5. How are the needs of your beginning faculty different from full professors? Associate professors?

III. Given your departmental situation, we would like to explore your roles as department chair.

6. Describe philosophically your perceptions of the role of the chair.

7. What are the most important roles and tasks you perform?

8. What do you need to do to achieve your perception of the ideal department?

9. What specific goals do you have for the department?

IV. In our previous questions we have explored the conditions in your department and the kinds of roles and tasks you perform. Now we would like to examine some issues involved with your career.

14. In what ways have your Dean and academic administrators been helpful to your career development?

15. During your administrative career, what are the two or three greatest satisfactions from your role as chair?

16. During your administrative career, what are the two or three greatest dissatisfactions?

V. Now that we have identified the conditions in your department and roles and tasks you perform, we would like to focus on some of the strategies you use to increase vitality of the department and your faculty.

10. In what ways have your Dean and academic administrator been helpful to you in developing the department and its faculty?

11. What materials have you found or developed that address some of your concerns about research, teaching, and service? What strategies have you found useful?

12. In helping faculty grow professionally, what strategies do you use to aid faculty to get involved in activities beyond the department and institution?

13. How do you help faculty deal with barriers to their self-development?

Thank you for your time and interest in the study. You have helped us establish a baseline to examine further considerations in the development of departmental and faculty vitality.

Appendix II

CHART I - CRITICAL ROLES AND ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

BASIC ROLE	DESCRIPTOR	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Communicator		
Strategy "Mgmt. by walking Around"	Honesty	-Provide straightforward feedback (Positive and Corrective) -Demonstrate consistency in response about important issues
	Openness	-Office arrangements show accessibility -Be a good listener Go to faculty - on their turf Be a "sounding board" Explore faculty interests
	Keep people informed	-One-to-one conversations -Drop in to faculty offices -Newsletters about acccmplishments -Weekly memos -Communication toward department goals
	Keep positive tone	-Tell people they're doing a good job (if they are) notes, letters, comments -Provide models - self and others -Develop others' ideas as well as one's own ideas -Provide influence and negotiation Speed up journal acceptances -Meet with new people every two weeks -Investigate issues before jumping to conclusions
Facilitator		
	Obtain whatever is necessary to accomplish tasks--remove obstacles	-Avoid saying "no" too often -Provide informal organization - group building -Ask the necessary questions -"Open forums" -"dragging people along" -Adjust loads/schedules -Follow up on needed activities
	Look for requests and proposals	-Outside funds -Papers at national meetings -Research Council -Summer research fellowships -Maintenance and securing of equipment -"Broker of" the interests of faculty
	Mentor	-Molding and socializing beginning faculty -Help hook up these faculty with faculty who have published -Help person along toward promotion and tenure

BASIC ROLE	DESCRIPTOR	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Academic Leader		
	Preside over academic program Develop "a community of scholars"	-Address curriculum concerns -Attract and select quality graduate students -Initiate Distinguished Faculty Awards -Recognize "currency" of the various fields -Encourage innovation in teaching, research, and service -Promote broadening activities such as dual degree programs, new courses, and innovative course delivery
	Provide overall direction of department	-Conduct meetings - "conduct the Orchestra" -Seek consensus on key issues -Manage internal dialogue -Discuss congruence of individual and departmental goals
	Selection of faculty	-Identify "curious people" -Hire people with experience - they bring grants and connections with them
	Encourage people to be better (growth, development, and excellence)	-Structure faculty exchanges about their work -Distribute their articles and products -Ask for courses faculty want to teach -Recommend for review panels
	Set academic expectation	-Everyone will be scholarly -Information on kinds of scholarly activities -Allocation of Effort Reports -Stick up for quality faculty not fitting usual mold or model
Motivator		
	"Protective role" - "Shield"	-Keep "static" out of the way - buffering -Integrate ideas of new faculty -Development of internal P & T document
	"Coach"	-Evaluation process -Goal setting with faculty -List of faculty accomplishments -Conferencing -Reinforce performance and expectations -Notes -Verbal praise -Recommendations
	Developmental Approach "developing people"	-Arrange "matches" of people's interests and organizational needs -"Differentiated staffing" -"Seed money" - discretionary money -Use of faculty leaves -Find leverage - what's meaningful to the individual -Rotation of assignments for self-development -"Drastic actions" for "remediation"
	Model	-Display high energy and positive attitude
Counselor		
	"Hand holder" Perspective taker	-Assessment of when people are down and respond to needs -Help faculty sort out payoffs -Help faculty "cut their losses" -Encourage retirements -Recognize various personal development needs and opportunities for faculty -Help relieve pressures and stress (e.g., Associate Professor) -Provide emotional support or link to needed support

BASIC ROLE	DESCRIPTOR	SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES
Politician		
	Link between department and central administration	-Convey importance of the work of the department
	Represent the department outside	-"Fight the departmental battles" a) Determine and implement "tradeoffs" b) Work for credit for faculty maintenance of the institution activities (advising, recruiting, teaching) c) Promote and legitimatize individual scholarly activities of faculty d) Secure outside dollars
Manager of "Administrivia"		
	Handling paperwork and basic organizational tasks	-Reporting -Budgeting -Scheduling -Social events (e.g., softball games)

REFERENCES

Ahmann, J. S. The emerging role of the department chairman: Be an administrative activist. In J. Brann & T. A. Emmet (Eds.), The academic department or division chairman; A complex role. Detroit: Balamp, 1972.

Baldwin, R. G., and R. T. Blackburn. "The Academic Career as a Developmental Process; Implications for Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, November/December 1981, 52 (6), 598-614.

Bennett, John. Managing the Academic Department: Cases and Notes. New York: MacMillan, 1983.

Booth, David B. The Department Chair: Professional Development and Role Conflict. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1982.

Bragg, Ann Kieffer. "The Socialization of Academic Department Heads: Past Patterns and Future Possibilities". Paper presented at the panel on "The Socialization and Training of Academic Department Heads: Research and Practice" at the Association for Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC, March 4, 1981.

Brown, J. Douglas. "Departmental and University Leadership" in Academic Departments - Problems Variations and Alternatives. McHenry and Associates, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1977.

Clark, Shirley M. and Darrell R. Lewis (ed.). Faculty Vitality and Institutional Productivity: Critical Perspectives for Higher Education. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1985.

Creswell, J. W., Seagren, A.T., and Henry, T.C. "Professional Development Training Needs of Departmental Chairpersons: A Test of the Bigler Model." Planning and Change. Winter 1979, 224-237.

Driver, Michael. "Career Concepts - A New Approach to Career Research" in J. Paap (ed.), New Dimensions in Human Resources Management. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Erickson, Erik. Identity and the Life Cycle. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

Furniss, W.T. Reshaping Faculty Careers. Washington, DC: American Council of Education, 1981.

Gaff, J.G., "The United States of America - Toward the Improvement of Lecturing" in D.C.B. Teacher (ed.) Staff Development in Higher Education. Kogan page Ltd, London, 1979.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Gould, R.L. Transformations Growth and Change in Adult Life. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Hodgkinson, H.L. "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators." Educational Record, Fall 1974, 55 (4), 263-274.

Hoy, W.K. and C.G. Miskel. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New york: Random House, 1982.

Jennerich, E. J. Competencies for academic chairpersons: Myths and Realities. Liberal Education, 67, 46-70, 1981.

Kanter, R.M. "Changing the Shape of Work: Reform in Academe". Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979, (1) - 3-10.

_____. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Knight, W. Hal, and Michael C. Holen. "Leadership and the Perceived Effectiveness of Department Chairpersons". Journal of Higher Education, Volume 56, (6), November/December 1985.

Levinson, D.J. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine, 1978.

Mathis, B.C. "Academic Careers and Adult Development: A Nexus for Research". Current Issues in Higher Education, 1979, (2), 21-24.

McLaughlin, G. W., J. R. Montgomery, A. R. Gravely, and R. T. Malian. "Factors in Teacher Assignments: Measuring Workload by Effort". Research in Higher Education, 14 (1981), 3-17.

Neumann, Y., & Boris, S. B. Paradigm development and leadership style of university department chairpersons. Research in Higher Education, 9, 291-302, 1978.

Palmer, D.D. and C.V. Patton. "Mid-Career Change Options in Academe: Experience and Possibilities". Journal of Higher Education, July/August 1981, 52 (4), 378-398.

Roach, J.H.I. "The Academic Departmental Chairperson: Functions and Responsibilities", Educational Record, 57 (1976) 13.

Schein, Edgar. Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Schuster, Jack H. and Howard R. Bowen. "The Faculty at Risk". Change, September/October 1985, 13-21.

Seagren, A.T. and Creswell, J.W. "A Comparison of Perception of Administrative Tasks and Professional Development Needs of Chairpersons/Heads of Departments in Australia and the U.S. Pan-Pacific Conference". Paper - Seoul, Korea 1985.

Tucker, Allen. Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership Among Peers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1981.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, "Summary Report of the Study of Academic Department Chairpersons at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln," Report of the Task Force on management Practice in higher Education, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1979.

Vaillant, G.E. Adaptation to Life. Boston: Little, Brown, 1977.

Weathersby, R. and J.M. Tarule. Adult Development; Implications for Higher Education. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1980.

Wolothiewioz, R.J. College Administrators' Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.